

Application No. 09/683,921

PATENT RESPONSE

REMARKS

Claims 1-46 are pending. Independent claims include Claims 1, 31-38, and 41-42, which Applicant Amended, with all other claims respectfully depending therefrom. Applicant did not add new matter with these amendments, support for which the Examiner can find in the original specification and claims as filed.

As a preliminary matter, Applicant presents the following table of cited prior art patents and patent applications for reference purposes, each of which the Examiner used to reject Applicant's Claims 1-46 over various combinations thereof, as identified below:

Inventor	Pat./App. No.
Clay	4,869,946
Bravenec	6,073,854
Addy	6,386,448
McGinty	6,010,970
McKee	US 2002/0038917
Fotland	4,935,335
Sandor	5,330,799
Guest	WIPO 00/09319
Gottfried	6,329,987
Christy	6,119,943
Lo	3,895,867

Now then, in the interest of clarity, the Item Numbers below correspond to the Examiner's Item Numbers in the Office Action.

1-2. Under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the Examiner rejected the following claims:

- Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 17, 22-23, and 38-41 as being anticipated by Clay.

Respectfully, Applicant traverses this rejection and requests the Examiner's withdrawal thereof.

3-14. Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the Examiner rejected the following claims:

- Claims 4 and 6 as being unpatentable over Clay in view of Bravenec;
- Claims 8, 9, 11, 31, and 42 as being unpatentable over Clay in view of Addy;
- Claims 10 and 16 as being unpatentable over Clay as applied to Claims 1 and 7 above, and further in view of McGinty;
- Claims 12 and 15 as being unpatentable over Clay as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of McKee;

Application No. 09/683,921

PATENT RESPONSE

- Claim 13 as being unpatentable over Clay as modified by McKee as applied to Claim 12 above, and further in view of Fotland;
- Claim 14 as being unpatentable over Clay as modified by McKee and Fotland as applied to Claim 13 above, and further in view of Sandor;
- Claims 18-21, 24, 28, and 30 as being unpatentable over Clay as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Guest;
- Claims 25-27 and 29 as being unpatentable over Clay as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Gottfried;
- Claims 32-34 as being unpatentable over Clay in view of Christy;
- Claims 34-37 as being unpatentable over Clay in view of Guest; and
- Claims 43-46 as being unpatentable over Clay as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Lo.

Respectfully, Applicant traverses these rejections and requests the Examiner's withdrawal thereof.

15. Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the two (2) telephone interviews on June 14, 2005 and June 16, 2005, wherein the Examiner and Applicant discussed the following: i) various cited prior art references, including the teachings of Clay and the inapplicability of Lo to Claims 43-46, as asserted by Applicant, and ii) Applicant's various proposed amendments to the claims. Although no formal agreement was reached regarding allowability, Applicant submits the amended claims, as shown above, for the Examiner's approval, which Applicant earnestly believes are in compliance with the Examiner's comments during said interview and which overcome each of the Examiner's rejections of Claims 1-46 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103.

Application No. 09/683,921

PATENT RESPONSE

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes Applicant has overcome the Examiner's rejection of Claims 1-46 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103. Accordingly, Applicant believes that Claims 1-46 are patentable, and Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in a condition for allowance, which Applicant respectfully requests.

Applicant believes this Response should allow the Examiner to allow the above-referenced patent application to issue as a U.S. patent without further amendments to the specification or claims. Thus, Applicant also requests notification to that effect.

If questions arise, please telephone the undersigned attorney.